

Yitai Hu (SBN 248085) (yhu@akingump.com)
Elizabeth H. Rader (SBN 184963) (erader@akingump.com)
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP
Two Palo Alto Square
3000 El Camino Real, Suite 400
Palo Alto, CA 94306
Telephone: (650) 838-2000
Facsimile: (650) 838-2001

Attorneys for Defendant
CORETRONIC CORPORATION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

SEIKO EPSON CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

v.

CORETRONIC CORPORATION,

Defendant.

CASE NO. C07-06055 CRB

**CORETRONIC CORPORATION'S
ANSWER TO SEIKO EPSON
CORPORATION'S AMENDED
COMPLAINT**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Coretronic Corporation ("Coretronic"), by its attorneys, submits its Answer in response to the Amended Complaint of Seiko Epson Corporation ("SEC") as follows. Coretronic's answer to SEC's Amended Complaint is made without waiver or prejudice to the claims already being litigated in Civil Action No. C 06-06946 MHP (EDL), also pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California.

PARTIES, JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. Coretronic admits, upon information and belief, that SEC is a company organized under the laws of Japan, with a place of business at 3-5 Owa 3-chome, Suwa-shi, Nagano-ken, 392-8502, Japan.

2. Coretronic admits that it a company organized under the laws of Taiwan, with a place of business at No.11, Li-Hsing Road, Science Park, Hsinchu, Taiwan 300, R.O.C. Except as specifically admitted, Coretronic denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 2.

3. Coretronic admits that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction of this matter under the patent laws of the United States of America. Except as specifically admitted, Coretronic denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 3.

4. Coretronic admits that venue is proper. Except as specifically admitted, Coretronic denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 4.

FACTS

5. Coretronic admits that it owns U.S. Patent Nos. 6,742,899 B1 (“’899 Patent”) and 6,739,831 B2 (“’831 Patent”). Except as specifically admitted, Coretronic denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 5.

6. Coretronic, upon information and belief, admits that Seiko Epson manufactures projectors that are sold in the United States.

7. Coretronic admits that a letter dated March 6, 2007, was sent by an officer of Coretronic to Seiko Epson, and that the letter stated that Coretronic “has determined that Seiko Epson projectors have infringed and are infringing [the] Coretronic patents.” Coretronic denies the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 7.

8. Denied.

9. Denied.

10. Denied.

11. Denied.

12. Coretronic admits that an actual controversy exists between Coretronic and Seiko Epson regarding Seiko Epson’s infringement of the ’899 and ’831 patents. Coretronic asserted claims for infringement of these patents by SEC in Civil Action No. C06-06946 MHP (EDL).

Dated: February 20, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP

By: _____/s/_____
Elizabeth H. Rader

Attorneys for Defendant
CORETRONIC CORPORATION

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38(b), Coretronic Corporation respectfully demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

Dated: February 20, 2008 Respectfully submitted,

AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP

By: _____/s/_____
Elizabeth H. Rader

Attorneys for Defendant
CORETRONIC CORPORATION